

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOLUME XXIV, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1931

WHOLE No. 659

Let the



MACMILLAN CLASSICAL SERIES

carry your students through their Latin course with these textbooks which provide in fine form the finest of material for today's High School study of Latin

*A unified series under the
general editorship of*

B. L. ULLMAN
*Professor of Latin
University of Chicago*

Now in the Series:

ELEMENTARY LATIN
Ullman and Henry

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN
Ullman and Henry

SECOND LATIN BOOK
and

SECOND LATIN BOOK—
Revised
Ullman and Henry

THIRD LATIN BOOK
Ullman, Henry, and White

True to the mark in content and presentation, pleasant to look at and profitable to use, they provide

CONTENT that meets the highest requirements in the field: the report of the Classical Investigation, and the recommendations of the College Entrance Examination Board.

TEACHABILITY under the conditions prescribed by modern pedagogy.

ILLUSTRATIONS that are unusual and plentiful, and of invaluable assistance in teaching.

UNITY that arises from consistent editorship and constant adherence to one group of aims.

PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN
Ullman and Smalley

EASY LATIN PLAYS
Lawler

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

Teachers like the D'Ooge books!

D'OUGE AND ROEHM'S JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS

A genuinely easy and interesting two-book course for young beginners, with plenty of connected reading, with constant correlation with English, with abundant drill, and with fascinating supplementary material and pictures. Very widely used. *Book One*, \$1.36. *Book Two*, \$1.56.

D'OUGE'S ELEMENTS OF LATIN

A standard book for first-year work. Many teachers will use no other! \$1.32.

D'OUGE AND EASTMAN'S CAESAR IN GAUL

Caesar presented as a fascinating story of exploration, adventure, and conquest, providing all the necessary grammar and composition for second-year work in Latin. This book is in high favor with teachers everywhere! \$1.72.

D'OUGE'S CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR

A standard book for quick and easy reference. \$1.48.

Ginn and Company

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1931

WHOLE NUMBER 659

SELF-REVELATION IN VERGIL¹ THE HEART OF A POET

When a familiar friend's birthday draws near, we tend to think not merely of his public deeds, but of his more intimate qualities; we dwell on memories of his childhood, anecdotes of his boyish adventures, his features in maturity, the inflection of his voice. When an important anniversary of the birth of a great poet is imminent, above all when the great poet is also a great friend, it is natural for us not only to appraise his work anew, but to seek a nearer approach to his personality. At this time we bring offerings, *more maiorum*, to the genius of Vergil^{2a}, as we know that reverent Romans of an age near his own paid homage to him. So Silius Italicus, Pliny the Younger tells us^b, 'used to celebrate Vergil's birthday with more solemnity than his own, especially at Naples, where he approached Vergil's tomb as if it were a temple'³. Two thousand years divide us from Vergil's birth, several thousand miles from the 'Tomba di Virgilio'; yet who of us would not the more eagerly look on Vergil's face and see into his heart?

The swarthy, serious face and the slender, seated form of the Hadrumetum mosaic⁴ may not be an accurate portrait of Vergil; but it at least corroborates the description of the ancient biographer, Donatus (= Suetonius)^{5a}. In this biography, or in others, we may read of Vergil's delicacy of health, of the maidenly modesty that won him the epithet of Parthenias, of the sweetness of his voice in reciting verse, of the shyness that moved him to avoid the public eye (how unlike Horace!), even by taking refuge in the nearest building. Other traditions are preserved that show us the poet at work, writing in prose, then turning passages rapidly

¹In spite of my decided preference for spelling the poet's name as *Virgil*, in this paper I conform with the usage of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

^{2a}The attitude of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* on *Vergil* versus *Virgil* was set forth in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.49 (November 16, 1907), by Professor Lodge, then Editor-in-Chief of the paper, in words of soundest wisdom.

Professor Greene sent me his paper in the spring of 1930, with the request that, in any event, it be not published in Volume 23. His paper, as well as others on Vergil, has had to wait its turn. C. K. >

^bEpistulae 3.7-8.

³See also Martial 12. 67.

⁴This is now in the Bardo Museum, near Tunis. It was published by the Fondation Piot, *Monuments et Mémoires* IV (Paris, 1897).

⁵It seems to me worth while to add a reference to one or two more accessible works in which this famous mosaic has been reproduced (I had to write to various persons last spring and fall to tell them where reproductions of it could be found). A reproduction of it, in colors, was published as the frontispiece of a volume entitled *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica* (Macmillan, 1898). See also a pamphlet entitled *Cruising with Aeneas: The Geography of his Voyage*, by Laura Helen Leach, 3 (published by the American Classical League, through its Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, 1930). In the *Fondation Piot, Monuments et Mémoires*, IV, to which Professor Greene refers at the beginning of this note, there is an article by P. Gauckler, entitled *Les Mosaïques Vergiliennes de Souase* (see pages 230-244). Gauckler thought that the mosaic, which he reproduced in colors, was an authentic portrait of Vergil, and that it dates from about the end of the first century A. D. C. K. >

^{5a}See my edition of the *Aeneid* (1928 version), Introduction, §§ 36, 37, 47. C. K. >

into verse, and, finally, in Vergil's own words, slowly 'licking the verses into shape as a bear licks her cubs'. For other light on the poet's life, we turn, as did those ancient biographers and commentators, perhaps more often than has been generally recognized, to the poet's own words^{3b}, including those works of the minor canon (the Appendix Vergiliana^{3c}) that we more confidently now than formerly dare to believe may have come from Vergil's pen. Of course it is in the pages of his major poems that we can look most clearly into the heart of a poet.

It is possible for us to-day, as perhaps for no generation in the past, to read Vergil with sympathy and understanding. Many years ago, Sellar pointed out⁴ why Vergil had been eclipsed and misunderstood during the great revival of Homeric study in the early part of the nineteenth century. To-day we read Homer with still greater wonder; but we have also come to understand Vergil better, and, in understanding him, to love him more and more. We are under a heavy debt to a host of scholars and lovers of Vergil, writing in several languages, of whose names I can hardly mention more than a few. Every mature reader of Vergil must reckon not only with the still useful commentary of Conington, and with the excellent school editions of Vergil now available, but with the articles or books of a number of devoted scholars. For judicious and sympathetic criticism, for example, we have the volumes of Sellar and Glover, for racy commentary the works of Henry, for illumination of Vergil's early career the writings of Skutsch, Rand, Frank, and DeWitt, for the discussion of the poet's literary art the treatises of Heinze, Prescott, and Cartault, for penetrating consideration of many special points the works of Norden, Boissier, Nettleship, Fowler, and Conway, for brief appreciations the brilliant and beautiful essays of St. Beuve, Myers, Garrod, and Mackail, and Tennyson's masterly poem written for the Mantuans⁵.

^{3b}Here reference may be made again to a paper by Professor Duane R. Stuart: see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 24. 71, note 1. C. K. >

^{3c}For recent discussions of the Appendix Vergiliana see e. g. *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 24.70, Israel E. Drabkin, *The Copa*, etc. (this work was reviewed, by Professor M. B. Ogle, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 24. 45-46), and a paper by Professor H. W. Prescott, *The Present Status of the Vergilian Appendix*, *The Classical Journal* 26.49-62 (October, 1930). C. K. >

⁴*Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil*, 68-77 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1883). <See my discussion of this matter, in *The Classical Journal* 2 (1908), 251-255. C. K. >

⁵Most of the items that Professor Greene had in mind are given, in very full detail, in my edition of the *Aeneid*, revised version (1928): see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 22.99-101. See my Introduction, §§ 355-360, under the names DeWitt (§ 359), Fowler (thrice, § 355), Frank (§ 350), Glover (§ 350), Heinze (§ 359), Mackail (§ 360), Myers (§ 350), Henry (§ 357), Nettleship (twice, § 359), Norden (§ 357), Prescott (§ 350), Sellar (§ 359). Many more items of importance are listed in my Introduction, §§ 355-363.

Professor Greene adds the following (I append some comments of my own): Boissier, *Gaston, The Country of Horace and Virgil*, translated from the French by D. Havelock Fisher (London, Unwin, 1896); Carcopino, *Jérôme, Virgile et le Mystère de la IVe Églogue* (Paris, L'Artisan du Livre, 1930); Cartault, *Augustin, L'Art de Virgile dans l'Aeneide* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1926); Conway, Robert Seymour, *New Studies of a Great*

From them we learn much of Vergil's relation to his predecessors and to his environment, and much that is new regarding the poet's purposes and his temperament and modes of thought and feeling. To such studies as theirs I am indebted for many points in the following pages.

Naturally, it is in the early poems of the minor canon (the Appendix Vergiliana), and in the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics* that Vergil reveals most directly some of the external facts of his life and his interests, as well as something of the purposes and the loyalties of his mature life. In the *Aeneid* he maintains the epic reserve with a fair degree of consistency, but there are times when he lifts the veil of anonymity, and bares his heart; the watchful student, reading between the lines, may often look behind the veil and see what Vergil means to convey but does not state directly. In such matters, learning counts for much, but learning is not all; one needs also the tact, the intuition that belong only to the scholar who is also in sympathetic relation with his author.

Young Vergil was a learned poet, steeped in the Greek literature of the great age as well as in that of the Alexandrine Age, and in the Roman writers who were all but contemporary with himself. In the eclectic fashion of many a young poet, but with a touch that becomes surer as he proceeds, he borrows at his pleasure from Homer and Theocritus, from Catullus and Lucretius. A mock-heroic pastoral (the *Culex*), a romantic epyllion (if the *Ciris* be Vergil's), bits of Catullan lampooning and parody, and Lucretian science, and school-pieces of other sorts (in the *Catalepton*), a jolly, quite elusive little sketch of the allurements of a way-side inn and its hostess (the *Copa*), perhaps a bitter invective (the *Dirae*), cursing the new occupant of his lost farm, are sufficiently varied and sufficiently successful experiments for a High School or a Freshman poet. Already there are hints of his lasting interests—love of country life and of peace, tender affection for flowers and little animals, sympathy with romantic

ladies in distress, an interest in the mighty and in their fall from power, in the tale of Troy, in the underworld. Already he is torn between the fascination of poetry and the claims of philosophy, and pens a resolute 'farewell to poetry', but with such obvious repinings that one knows what to make of his positively last appearance as a poet. No, Vergil was not to be a philosopher in any technical sense; but, science apart, he was always to brood on "the doubtful doom of human kind", on human responsibility and divine interference, on natural causes and chance or fate⁶. There is a direct reference to Vergil's personal fortunes in the brief poem (*Catalepton* 8) in which, during the emergency of the confiscations, he commends to the safety of the little farm and the villa that once belonged to his master, the Epicurean philosopher Siron, those near and dear to him, and first of all his father. To this affectionate touch we shall refer again.

Not only these youthful *jeux d'esprit* but the more finished *Bucolics* might be regarded by their author as *tennia carmina*, 'thin-spun pieces'^{7a}; but the expression is conventional, as is the verb *ludere*, which meant to write sportive verse on pastoral or erotic themes. Some years later the poet calls himself *audax iuventa*⁷ in having sung these pastoral songs. The *Bucolics* indeed are ambitious. With the learned allusiveness of his earlier verse, and musical and richly descriptive pictures of country life Vergil essays in the *Bucolics* to combine much else. These are no merely Italian shepherds who pipe and sing, no mere shadows of Theocritean shepherds. These Arcadians inhabit no restricted province, least of all the bleak uplands of the real Arcadia; they are, above all, the creations of the poet's fancy, peopling a visionary world that is as old as time and as young as ourselves. *Iam formosissimus annus*, 'Now the year is in its most beauteous prime', and *Omnia vincit amor*, 'Tis love that makes the world go round', are its maxims. In *Hinc alta sub rupe canet frondator ad auras*⁸, 'Beneath yon crag shall the leaf-gatherer sing to the breeze', well does Vergil paint the scene in the days of his youth, and well does he send the song of the vine-dresser on into the future, for it is a perennial song. I have heard it in the hills near Veii, just such an artless song flung, day-long, to the wind, and again in Sicily, as others have heard it elsewhere in Italy or in America or wherever youth is happy and untrammelled.

That is one part of what Vergil has done in the *Bucolics*; but there is another side. In the words *molle*

Inheritance (London, John Murray, 1921. See the chapters entitled *The Youth of Vergil*, 66-104, and *The Place of Dido in the History of Europe*, 140-164. This book was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.210-211; Conway, Robert Seymour, *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age* (Harvard University Press, 1928); Garrod, W. H., a paper entitled *Vergil*, in the volume called *English Literature and the Classics*, edited by C. S. Gordon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912. See pages 144-166. This book was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.125-127); Rand, Edward K., *Young Vergil's Poetry*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 30 (1919), 102-185; St. Beuve, *Étude Sur Virgile* (Paris, C. Lévy, 1878); Skutsch, Frans, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, two parts (Leipzig, Teubner, 1901, 1906).

It would be very easy to extend this list. I hope presently to publish a volume which shall contain an index to the revised versions of my editions of Vergil and Ovid, and a Vergilian Bibliography. See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 23.1-2 (October 7, 1929). I will, however, add here two or three things: Carcopino, Jérôme, *Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie* (Paris, Boccard, 1919); Mackail, J. W., *The Aeneid*, Edited with Introduction and Commentary (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1930); Saunders, Catharine, *Vergil's Primitive Italy* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1930); *The Tradition of Virgil*, Three Papers on the History and Influence of the Poet, by Junius S. Morgan, Kenneth McKenzie, and Charles G. Osgood (Princeton University Press, 1930).

In 1930, the American Classical League, through its Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, published a pamphlet written by Professor John W. Spaeth, Jr., entitled *Vergiliana*, A Selected List of Books for Library Exhibits, etc. (30 Pages). Very useful, too, is a pamphlet published in the spring of 1930 by The New York Public Library, in connection with its Vergilian Exhibit. This was entitled *Bimillennium Vergilianum LXX A. C. A. D. MCMXXX*. A Vergilian Exhibition Held at The New York Public Library. List of Books and Manuscripts With an Introductory Essay by Charles Knapp (illustrated. 40 pages). C. K. >

⁶For illustrations from these early poems see W. C. Greene, *Young Virgil and "The Doubtful Doom of Human Kind"*, *The American Journal of Philology* 43 (1922), 344-351.

^{7a}See *Culex* 1-4, 35; *Ciris* 19; *Dirae* 26; *Bucolics* 1.2, 6.5, 8; *Georgics* 4. 565. <Until there shall be far more agreement among scholars than there is at present that the poems of the Appendix Vergiliana are all, or practically all of them, from Vergil's hand, the tendency to quote them in support of statements about Vergil seems to me most regrettable. Certainly the reader should be most carefully warned that many still are sceptical about the Vergilian authorship of parts at least of the Appendix Vergiliana. See again Professor Prescott's paper, named in note 3, c. above. One, who has seen what happened in the case of the dramatic *satira* largely, I feel persuaded, because certain impressive-looking papers were allowed to go unchallenged, can only be apprehensive about the effect of certain most attractive works on Vergil whose authors build very heavily on the Appendix Vergiliana as a foundation. C. K. >

⁷*Georgics* 4. 565.

⁸*Bucolics* 1.56.

atque facetus (Sermones 1.10.44) Horace sums up the magic of his friend's achievement; *molle* here = "the yielding susceptibility to outward influences . . .", and *facetus* = "the vivacity which gives them back in graceful forms . . .".⁹ The lively play of Vergil's fancy is also building up a world of people, half real, half imaginary, which claims his allegiance. There are his friends and his brother poets, to whom he pays his respects, and with whom he plays elaborate literary games, in which borrowed lines, capping of verses, allusion, and allegory all have their part.¹⁰ There is his craving for peace, always apparent, and now brought to a sharp focus by the personal loss of his farm, and presently by his growing patriotic hope that the Roman world may at last find a respite from civil war. So Vergil pictures a Golden Age (Bucolics 4) in terms drawn probably from sources wholly pagan, but reading here and there like Messianic prophecy, and concluding with a bit of unique tenderness in the address to the child whose birth is to usher in the new era.¹¹

In his hopes of peace, Vergil looks to various champions. Julius Caesar had been a tyrant, but Vergil regards his death as a calamity, and in pastoral guise¹² describes his apotheosis, perhaps straining the plausibilities of allegory. Pollio is for a time his champion; but it finally devolves on the young Octavian to bear the rising hopes of lovers of peace. Vergil was, indeed, perhaps the first Augustan; he was an Augustan even

before there was an Augustus¹³. The ruthless young Octavian, the coauthor of the proscriptions, will require more than a little education before he will become the wise and clement Augustus. There is much to attract us in the view of Professor Conway that Vergil's own influence was a principal force in winning the young Octavian for the cause of humanity¹⁴. At any rate such confiscations of land as Vergil deplored in the Bucolics were not perpetrated by the victor of Actium, who paid no less than 860,000,000 sesterces for the land on which he settled his veterans, as he records in the Monumentum Ancyranum. What if the heart of the poet is so early compelling the heart of the world to beat with itself? What wonder if the young Octavian, a new man of destiny who is saving the world by his new policy of reconciliation, should seem more and more a very present help in time of trouble, a very god!

O Meliboe, deus nobis haec otia fecit,
namque erit ille mihi semper deus. . . .

In such religious, half-mystical wise does Vergil yearn for better times (Bucolics 1.6-7).

The Bucolics were finished, nor need Vergil be ashamed of them. In Bucolics 5, he cited Bucolics 2 and 3 by quoting from their first lines; when, as a recognized poet, he came to sign and date the Georgics (Georgics 4.559-566), it was as 'Vergil, who, emboldened by my youth, sang in play the shepherd's songs, and sang, Tityrus, of you beneath the covering shade of the spreading beech-tree. . .'. So the last line of the Georgics echoes the first line of the Bucolics. Once more, in all probability, Vergil struck this autobiographical note. In complete texts of Vergil, though not in school editions, the Aeneid begins, not with the famous words *Arma virumque cano*, but with four prefatory verses,

Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatur avena
carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Mar-
tis. . . .

'I, the poet who once framed my song on slender oaten straw, and then, when I had left the woodlands, compelled the neighboring fields to serve the husbandman, be he never so grasping—a task pleasing to farmers—, now <sing> of the bristling <arms> of Mars. . .'. The trumpet blast continues in the lines that we all know. Read the amusingly stated arguments, fourteen of them, given by Henry (1.2-27), for believing that Vergil wrote the verses, read the older and equally amusing denunciation of these lines by Dryden, and then make up your mind whether to agree with the testimony of Donatus and Servius that Vergil wrote them, and that Varius (keeping within Vergil's dying instructions) deleted them, with the result that among the better manuscripts only one, a comparatively late manuscript, contains the verses, added in the margin by a still later hand. The verses are not unlike those at the end of the Georgics (a circumstance which, un-

⁹Sellar, Vergil, 164. In the words there may also be a reference to a classification of rhetorical styles; compare C. N. Jackson, *Molle atque Facetum*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 25 (1914), 117-137.

¹⁰In The American Journal of Philology 38 (1917), 194-199, I discussed this passage. I noted that in The American Journal of Philology 37 (1916), 327-332, Professor M. B. Ogle had, so I said, successfully refuted Professor Jackson's explanation of Horace's words. I then offered what still seems to me an explanation far simpler and far better than the explanations offered by Professors Jackson and Ogle. I confined myself to the word *facetus*, and I brought forth evidence that Horace meant by *facetus* the one and only thing that this word would naturally have suggested then, or would naturally suggest now to a reader, the idea of pleasantries, quips and quirks, *ridicula*. Scholars are far too prone to over-subtlety; contemporary readers of Horace or of Quintilian were not philologists raised to the nth power.—I may add that Professor Tenney Frank discusses the Horatian passage, in his paper Vergil's Apprenticeship. III, Classical Philology 15 (1920), 230-244; see especially 230-234. C. K. >

¹¹Compare J. S. Phillimore, *Pastoral and Allegory: A Re-reading of Virgil's Bucolics* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925).

¹²I agree with W. Warde Fowler that the tone of these verses implies a definite child (see his paper, *Observations on the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 14 (1903), 17-35, reprinted in the volume entitled *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, by J. B. Mayor, W. Warde Fowler, and R. S. Conway (London, Murray, 1907)). But the identity of the child remains uncertain, in spite of all arguments, unless Carcopino can be said to have solved the mystery in finding the child to be the son of Pollio, who was born in 40 B. C., and died in infancy (Carcopino's work, *Virgile et le Mystère*, etc., is named in note 5, above). Pollio, at any rate, is still the titular head of the State, the only Roman named in the poem; and other historic circumstances support Carcopino's theory. Pollio is invoked, indeed, with a repeated and peculiar emphasis. We may note in passing Vergil's other pictures of childhood, e. g. in Ascanius, especially his little steps as he tries to keep pace with his father (Aeneid 2.723-724), and the cry that escapes the lips of the broken-hearted Dido, that her desertion would seem more endurable if she only had a *parvulus Aeneas* to play in her halls and recall his father's features in his own (Aeneid 4.327-330). Thus, by the way, does Vergil deftly appropriate a beautiful touch from Catullus (61.209-218). The treatment of childhood in Greek and Roman literature is a subject that has never received sufficient attention. <On this subject see e. g. the note by Miss Mary Johnston, *Once More Children in Latin Literature*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.39, and the references given there to other remarks on the subject in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

It is an old grievance of mine that so much good work on classical subjects lies buried in the 'Studies' published by various Universities. I call attention here to two papers by Professor J. E. Church: *The Identity of the Child in Vergil's Pollio*, University of Nevada Studies 2 (1908), 67-85, and *The Identity of the Child in Vergil's Pollio: An Afterword*, *ibidem*, 5 (1911), 1-15. C. K. >

¹³Bucolics 5.

¹⁴Compare the work of N. W. DeWitt named in note 5, above.

¹⁵R. S. Conway, *Poetry and Government*, Presidential Address, Proceedings of the <English> Classical Association, 25 (1928), 19-38.

supported, might argue either genuineness or forgery); but, if Vergil wrote the verses, his editors surely showed good judgment in removing them, for the poet could now reveal himself better than in this manner; indeed, he had already in the *Georgics* shown far more of himself.

Every sensitive reader of the *Georgics* realizes that, although the professed purpose of the poem is didactic, the work is much more than a handbook of farm-lore. That point I need not labor here. On almost every page we find evidence of a personal interest in all the natural processes that bind man to the beloved land, and a passion for the *divini gloria ruris*, for mother earth, for mother Italy. This it is, more than propaganda of any sort, that animates the poem, *singula dum capti circumvectamur amore* (3.285). So the poet records his personal observations: *saepe ego vidi*, he writes as he tells of a storm falling on the crops (1.316); *memini...vidisse senem*, he says (4.125-127), introducing the delectable account of the old Cilician's flower-garden near Tarentum. It is not mere information about the economy of farming and its value in healing the world of civil war that Vergil aspires to give, but a suggestion of the possible influence of an active country life on a sensitive soul—an active life, for the piping shepherd of the *Bucolics* has almost disappeared, supplanted by the hard-working farmer: instead of *Omnia vincit amor* we read (1.146-147) *Labor omnia vicit improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas*. Yet Vergil is writing no less of him and for him who is endowed with what Wordsworth called "a wise passivity", for one who delights to brood upon things and their inwardness. But what is Vergil? Is he poet or philosopher? Again Vergil seems to halt between two opinions, between the Lucretian or Epicurean scientist (1.410-423) and the more instinctive lover of nature who trusts to the promptings of his poet's heart. He pays his homage to Lucretius, and in the same breath flings him a challenge. Before all else he would fain know the causes of natural phenomena; but, if such knowledge be denied him, may he, lost to fame, find his delight in the countryside, the streams that water the valleys, the woods. 'Happy', he cries (2.475-494), 'the man who has availed to learn the causes of things, and has trampled under foot all fear and inexorable fate; blessed, too, he who has known the gods of the country, and Pan, and old Silvanus, and the sister nymphs!' If this be a *pisaller*, well, let us make the best of it. It deserves to be ranked with the *δεύτερος πλοῦς*, the 'second best' means of navigation that, according to Plato (Phaedo 99 C), young Socrates was driven to adopt in his disenchantment with the science of his day; this second best method is nothing less than the Theory of Ideas! In such a hesitant manner does Vergil, too, confess the faith that is in him.

You will remind me that the *Georgics* is also propaganda. Yes, it is propaganda of a subtle sort. Vergil wrote the *Georgics*, the ancient biographers tell us, at the suggestion of Maecenas; indeed he himself refers (3.40) to the poem as *Tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa*, and adds that without Maecenas his mind

ventures nothing lofty; and he addresses his friend as the one who deserves a great share in whatever glory his verse may win (2.40): *O decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae*. . . . It was Maecenas who took up the reading of the poem when Vergil's voice failed him, on the occasion of the formal reading of the poem before Octavian in Campania, a couple of years after Actium (Donatus [= Suetonius], *Vita Vergilii* 27). Octavian he still is, we must note, not yet Augustus; the land policy, the counsels of peace, and the note of Italian patriotism set forth in the poem are not servile utterances inspired by deference to an imperial patron, but the characteristic ideas of Vergil himself, the mature poet now rising to an understanding of his country's needs. Peace, especially freedom from civil war, renewal of the ancient honor given to the plough, encouragement to dispossessed farmers to return to the soil, exhortation to veteran soldiers to take up farming, together with hints of the kindness, the simplicity of heart, and the industry of the old Italic farmers of the *Saturnia regna*, that Golden Age of Latin myth, are the cardinal points of Vergil's programme, the programme of an idealist who is not wholly an impractical dreamer. The picture of the Golden Age is by this time familiar, from the Greek romances (e. g. Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*) and the satire of Lucian (*Vera Historia* 2), from the idyllic description of Catullus (64. 1-30), from the meditations of the shepherd in the *Culex* on the joys of country life (58-97), from the picture of the western Islands of the Blessed which Horace, during the hopeless years of Civil War, painted (*Epode* 16. 41-66) as an imaginary refuge for patriotic Romans, from Vergil's own Messianic pastoral (*Bucolics* 4. 18-45). Something of this Golden Age invests the later picture of the primitive Rome of Evander, a Rome of dignified poverty in days when men 'dared to despise wealth' (*Aeneid* 8.364-365). But, as Vergil challenged Lucretius, so he now challenges Horace. Here, he is saying, is a Golden Age equal to the legendary age; it is no mere fancy of a hopeless mood, nor is it an irrecoverable age of the remote past; it is here and now, for those who labor with good will, in an Italy rich in the gifts of nature and hallowed by ancient heroism (*Georgics* 2.136-176), now given a new lease of opportunity by a young conqueror and benefactor, a *εὐεργέτης* who, like the Oriental and the Greek helpers of men, has earned divine honors, yes, and may choose his place in the skies as a new constellation (*Georgics* 1.24-42). For him Vergil prays fervently, as the young man who may bring succor to an age turned topsy-turvy¹⁵. The new age is one whose possibilities depend both on the changed attitude of the whole people and on the enlightened leadership of one man; to him Vergil seems to be commending the whole picture of a new world at peace and contented. In the epilogue of the *Georgics*¹⁶ he describes Octavian not merely as 'thundering in war by the Euphrates', but as a victor who 'gives laws to willing peoples', and so

¹⁵*Georgics* 1.498-501. Compare *Aeneid* 6.701-705, where again it is as the founder of a new Golden Age of Saturn that Augustus is described.

¹⁶*Georgics* 4.560-567. Compare the more familiar description of Rome's mission to the world, *Aeneid* 6.847-853.

wins his way to heaven. Is Professor Conway exceeding the bounds of probability when he attempts to show that not only here but in many other cases Vergil is creating the pattern which Augustus actually followed?¹⁷ Certainly the age of Augustus became a Golden Age, one of whose chief glories was that humanity which Vergil never ceased to suggest and exemplify. Augustus, in his autobiography, declares¹⁸, 'After my victory, I spared the lives of all surviving citizens; as for foreign peoples, I preferred to save those that could be pardoned with security rather than to destroy them'.

If Vergil could hope by the power of his verse to mould the destinies of the world in any such fashion, his propaganda was fraught with tremendous possibilities, and he was playing for high stakes, for which he might well make no small sacrifice. Such a sacrifice, perhaps, he made. The *Georgics* in its present form is a second version, in which the latter half of the fourth book, a group of tales but slightly connected with the chief theme, replaces (according to Servius) what Vergil originally wrote, an encomium on Egypt and on his dear friend, the elegist Cornelius Gallus, his love for whom, as he sang in the last poem of the *Bucolics* (10.73-74), 'grew hourly, like the green alder in early spring'. Gallus had been the trusted agent of Augustus, and had been Prefect of Egypt; but his arrogant behavior had brought the censure of Augustus, and he had committed suicide, to the grief both of Vergil and of Augustus. The Emperor, Suetonius says (Augustus 66), grieved because he only of men could not afford to be angry with a friend; Vergil dropped from his poem the lines on Gallus, and repaired the omission with the tales of Aristaeus and of Orpheus and Eurydice. This he did, *iubente Augusto*, says Servius¹⁹. But did Servius necessarily know that any such command was given by the Emperor? What Vergil did, Servius doubtless knew; but that Vergil did it in a spirit of servile obedience to a patron we need not believe, nor need we, like most of Vergil's editors, apologize for an assumed act of opportunism and betrayal of a dead friend's memory. No; Vergil saw clearly that the new age, which was dawning so auspiciously, must not be jeopardized by being linked with memories of foolish adventurers, even though they might be dear friends, and so the verses on Gallus must be forgotten. But if Augustus, who had heard the verses read in Campania a few years before, still remembered them, what misgivings he must have felt when he realized how much his anger had cost Vergil!

One of Vergil's readers who understood the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics* might almost have been able to predict some of the qualities that would be certain to find expression in the *Aeneid*. Not without reason could Propertius exclaim (3.64-65), as the new epic took form, *Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade!*, for the personal qualities of Vergil make of the *Aeneid* something richer, more artful, than the simpler, less designing Homeric Poems. Homer sometimes de-

ceives us by an artlessness and simplicity that are illusory, for his poems are far from being the mere impromptu expressions of daemonic inspiration. But in Vergil we are still more conscious throughout of an author's deliberate creation, of tales retold with a new purpose, of forces in conflict that must be reconciled, of a brooding on profound human problems that can at best be thrown into relief without ever being fully solved. Aeneas has not quite the glamor of Achilles or the immediate interest of Odysseus; Dido has not the fascination of Helen, the matronly affection of Andromache, the girlish charm of Nausicaa; in other words, Vergil is not Homer. Vergil, however, has drawn upon Homer and upon countless other sources, writing, as has well been said²⁰, "on palimpsests"; and he succeeds above all in impressing on his readers the tremendous issues at stake, for his characters, for the very foundations of Rome, for mankind.

Consider for a moment some of the interests and the forces that Vergil projects into his epic. He has already abandoned a first attempt at an epic on *res Romanae, offensus materia*; the theme, whether on the legend of Romulus, or, as is more likely, on recent Roman history, was not suitable²¹. In the *Aeneid* he deals both with the remote legendary past (the theme of most successful epics) and with recent events and their possible consequences, bridging the gap by the technical expedients of prophecies and antiquarian lore and allegory²². Furthermore, Vergil, who was himself a native of Cisalpine Gaul, a province which technically became part of the Roman State only when he was twenty-one years old, knew men who held vivid memories of the terrible Social War, fought only twenty years before his birth, in which Rome's *socii*, the Italic allies, had done battle for the full Roman franchise. This, too, is reflected in the seventh book of the *Aeneid*, which, if it "is at the point when, to modern readers, the interest of the *Aeneid* is all but over"²³, is the point where Vergil approaches what he calls his *maius opus* (7.45).

Past and present, Italy and Rome, thus converge in a great process of reconciliation. But there are great obstacles, not merely the calamitous fall of Troy, the wanderings of Aeneas and his comrades, their ineffectual efforts to make a new home for themselves, and the shipwreck at Carthage, not merely the opposition of Juno, whom Vergil calls Saturnia, as the goddess of ancient Italy²⁴, but the two great tragedies built into the form of the epic in which the *pietas* ('devotion') of Aeneas is brought into conflict first with the human affections of Dido, then with the patriotism and the *violentia* of the Italian Turnus and his allies.

(To be concluded)

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM CHASE GREENE

¹⁷N. W. DeWitt, *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria*, 97.

¹⁸See my remarks on the place, or the lack of place, of history in epic poetry, remarks to be found in *The Classical Journal* 19 (1924), 198-210. C. K. >

¹⁹For the prophecies compare C. H. Moore, *Prophecy in the Epic*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 32 (1921), 133-142; for the allegory compare D. L. Drew, *The Allegory of the Aeneid* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1927). <On the use of prophecy by Vergil in the *Aeneid* see my remarks in *The Classical Journal* 19 (1924), 210-214. C. K. >

²⁰See G. Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism*, I.339.

²¹Compare N. Moseley, *Characters and Epithets. A Study in Vergil's Aeneid*, 29-42. <On this book see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 23.190-191. C. K. >

¹⁷R. S. Conway (as cited in note 14, above), 32-35.

¹⁸*Monumentum Ancyranum* 83.

¹⁹In his note on *Bucolics* 10.1. <See also his note on *Georgics* 4.1. C. K. >

REVIEW

A Survey of Ancient History to the Death of Constantine. By M. L. W. Laistner. Boston and New York: D. C. Heath and Company (1929). Pp. xiii + 613. \$3.80.

In the volume entitled *A Survey of Ancient History*, etc., Professor M. L. W. Laistner has undertaken a difficult task in attempting to survey within the compass of 582 pages of text the whole history of the Near East and the Mediterranean World from the earliest times to the death of Constantine. Given the limits imposed, it must be said that he has done an admirable bit of compression. The book is packed with information that is everywhere up-to-date and is presented with great clarity.

The author's principles of historiography are conservative and represent a protest against the more extreme applications of the archaeological method (2-3):

...Again, it will rarely be possible to write a continuous history of a state or of a long epoch, if the material available for their reconstruction is wholly or mainly archaeological and epigraphic....

...Yet the new method of reconstructing the past sometimes seems in danger of being carried too far. Political, military, and constitutional history is relegated to second place, and page after page is devoted to the treatment of social or economic history.

The portion of the book (16-117) devoted to the ancient East is somewhat thin and is presented without enthusiasm. At the same time, it must be admitted that it is clear, is nowhere misleading, and is skilful in its avoidance of controversial matters that would merely serve to confuse the beginner. The best written as well as fullest section in the volume is that devoted to Greek history (118-331). Here the narrative moves swiftly. The author's obvious interest in the matter in hand is further reflected in a greater use of footnotes, which are here not only more numerous but fuller than elsewhere in the volume. The portion of the chapter that deals with the century following Alexander's death (344-352) is too compressed, especially in the treatment of the *diadochoi*, to be of much use. The following chapter (353-367) on the general features of the Hellenistic Age is much better, in spite of the too scant treatment of the economic phases. The story of the Roman Republic is told with great skill (368-494); the narrative of political events from 78-29 B. C. is a piece of exposition little short of amazing in lucidity, compactness, and full presentation of essential details. The treatment of the Roman imperial period (495-582) shows signs of hastier composition, and is, on the whole, the least satisfactory portion of the book, largely as the result of the inadequacy of the space allotted to it.

The chief fault to be found with the work is perhaps in the proportions of its several parts. This may be seen by a glance at the following summary of the contents of the volume: Method, Sources, Chronology, and Stone Age (1-15); The Ancient East to the Fall of Ninevah (16-117); Greece to the Death of Philip II (118-331); Alexander, Hellenistic Age (332-

367); Roman Republic (368-494); Roman Empire (495-582).

The classical bias is here evident at a glance. The pages devoted to Greece must be reduced by thirteen to allow for a well-placed and well-articulated chapter entitled *The Near and Middle East in the Sixth Century B. C.* (174-186). On the other hand, of the one hundred pages given to the Ancient East twenty deal with the pre-Hellenic civilization of the Aegean region and with Homeric society. The little space assigned to the Roman Empire is further, though slightly, cut into by overlapping with the Republican period in two chapters called *The Economic Development of the Empire c. 100 B. C.-211 A. D.* (534-546) and *Literature, Art, and Religion c. 100 B. C.-200 A. D.* (547-565).

I present another exhibit to show how Professor Laistner has allotted space to certain themes: Peloponnesian War, 27 pages, Second Punic War, 10 pages, Chapter V: Egyptian Civilization, 8 pages, Literature (Lucretius to Lucian), 8 pages, Christianity, Church, etc., about 6 pages.

This exhibit suggests sober reflections on the large question of what constitutes history.

A few other comparisons may be illuminating. Four pages are given to a characterization, excellent in itself, of Thucydides (in Chapter XVII), as against the eight pages noted above for the literature of the first century B. C. and the first two centuries A. D. In this latter section Persius, Gellius, Fronto, Philo Judaeus, Josephus, Dio of Prusa, and Aelius Aristides find no place. If we grant the reasonableness of these omissions, how are we to justify the inclusion in an earlier chapter e. g. of Crates of Mallus, or of Critolaus the Peripatetic? Ventidius Bassus is noticed as an able lieutenant of Antony; the services rendered to Augustus by M. Agrippa are entirely passed by!! Is historical significance the criterion? Agrippa is later introduced to father the two young Caesars, whose significance, it will be recalled, is largely that they might have been important had they not unfortunately died too soon. The slighting of Agrippa (and of Maecenas, too, by the way) is the more remarkable, since Professor Laistner presents the usual rigmarole about Sejanus (in some detail), and, more briefly, about Seneca and Burrus, Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus, etc. Though mention is made (557) of the recent discovery of a Roman theater at Caerleon in Monmouthshire, a theater capable of seating about 4,600 spectators, and of the fact that in the typical Roman temple the ambulatory was often dispensed with and the three-stepped stereobate was not favored, we look in vain for any mention of Timgad or of Doura, of Pompeii and Herculaneum, or of the imperial fora!

An inquisitive reader moved by the interesting account of Greece in the earlier periods might be curious as to what happened to Greece after the First Mithridatic War. He would have to content himself with learning that, under Augustus, Achaia became a separate Senatorial province. There is, in other words, no survey of conditions in the older settled provinces.

There is a chapter of twelve pages (521-533) dealing with the frontier in the first and the second centuries A. D. Of these twelve pages, one is a map of Britain and four more recite the doings of such gentry as Aulus Plautius, Ostorius Scapula, Suetonius Paulinus, Petilius Cerealis, Julius Agricola, and Lollius Urbicus in Britain. This, if we count in the map, somewhat exceeds the combined space allotted to Pompey's campaigns and arrangements in the East and Caesar's conquest of Gaul, or, to make another comparison, exceeds the space allotted to the history of the Antigonid, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid dynasties with the Attalids of Pergamon thrown in.

Criticisms of this sort might be multiplied and are perhaps a trifle unfair. It must not be supposed that Professor Laistner was not aware of the problem confronting him. He remarks in his Preface (v):

... Much has had to be omitted; much had needs to be compressed into a paragraph. Yet, in the process of selection and arrangement, I have striven to secure clarity and balance, and to avoid assigning a disproportionate amount of space to any particular topic or period. That some epochs or subjects have nevertheless been treated more fully than others is due either to the existence of ampler source material or to the fact that their significance was greater and that they exerted a more lasting influence.

The whole matter is highly subjective. Professor Laistner would probably be surprised were he to find universal agreement that he had successfully put into practice the principles cited above.

In the Preface, the author further tells us that the book grew out of the absence of a suitable work in one volume to serve as a text-book to accompany a course of undergraduate lectures in ancient history. For such a course in two terms, I say without hesitancy that I know of no better book. My academic duties require me to present such a course in four terms. The present work is useful in the second and the third terms of the cycle, but quite inadequate for the first and the fourth. If it be not out of place to obtrude a pedagogical problem, I should like to suggest brief specifications for a much needed volume. That would be a book, about the size of Professor Laistner's book, in which the author would devote about two hundred pages to the Ancient East, three hundred to Greek history to Alexander, and about one hundred to the Hellenistic East. Such a work used in conjunction with Professor A. F. R. Boak's excellent history of Rome would come nearest to meeting my own particular text-book needs.

I have commended the present work for the amount of definite information it succeeds in packing into a limited space. It may be well, however, to point out that the quality of this information varies. That the province of Mauritania was divided into two districts called Caesariensis and Tingitana is information of a sort; it would no doubt tend to soften the shock in the somewhat improbable event of the student's encountering these names again. But, so far as conveying any substantive knowledge is concerned, the totally incorrect information that the parts were called North and South Dakota would be as useful. Again,

it is surely not very profitable, as it is also a little startling, to learn on page 550, after the Index has been duly consulted, that Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius were three "others" (i. e. poets) "whose works enjoyed a deserved popularity". Fortunately the book does not often become so jejune as this, though other instances might be cited from the last ninety pages.

There are forty illustrations, all of them good. Their distribution, however—Babylonian 2, Egyptian 3, Cretan-Mycenaean 7, Greek 22, Roman 6—exaggerates the tendency already remarked with regard to the text. The balance is scarcely redressed by the Frontispiece, showing the Roman Forum. The maps are of poorer quality, and do not always show the places mentioned in the text. The Index (599-613) is accurate, but incomplete. On pages 583-598 there is an excellently chosen Bibliography with, here and there, a title annotated.

A further thought that suggests itself is that a book of this type always seems better to author, or to teacher, or even to reviewer than it does to the student; the first three read between the lines and unconsciously take for granted much that is strange to the beginning student, who finds the compactness of the work much more advantageous for review than for attacking the subject for the first time. The student who uses this particular book will have good use for a dictionary for such technical and quasi-technical language as "buon frescoes", "aniconic religion", "levirate marriage", and "predial serfdom". This tendency toward the technical, coupled with a striving after compactness and variety, also gives rise to such expressions as "Dioctetianic system of taxation" and "Trajanic pillar". Surely the latter expression is jargon.

To summarize my impressions, I recur to the point from which I started: it is a difficult task that Professor Laistner has undertaken. It is fair to add that he has done extremely well what no one is ever likely to do to the complete satisfaction of every one else.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

ERNEST L. HETTICH

A CORRECTION—APOLOGIES

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 24.150, column 2 (March 23, 1931), in the course of a review by Professor Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., of Friedrich Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, etc., there is a most unfortunate blunder, for which I am myself wholly responsible. I refer to the sentence which runs as follows:

... It seems obvious that a lexicon should list *all* words in alphabetical order regardless of special interest, and that a reader, once he has discovered his word, should be able to turn to another volume and run down in it first the numbered classification, then, under this, the alphabetized word¹⁹....

This should have been printed in the following form:

... It seems obvious that a lexicon should list *all* words in alphabetical order regardless of special interest, and that a reader, once he has discovered his word, should be spared the trouble of turning to another volume and running down in it first the numbered classification, then, under this, the alphabetized word¹⁹....

I regret exceedingly that I blundered. I offer my apologies to Professor Kraemer, to the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, and to my more careful editorial self.

CHARLES KNAPP

CICERO, IN CATILINAM 3.15, AGAIN

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 24.129-130 (March 9, 1931) Professor Knapp discusses Cicero, In Catilinam 3.15. It seems to me that he vastly underrated Cicero as a Latinist, as a stylist, as an orator, and as a politician.

I am convinced that we have that sentence as Tiro took it down in his Notae Tironianae during Cicero's delivery of it from the Rostra. I am of the opinion that Cicero was speaking *ex tempore*, with no more previous preparation than perhaps some brief outline notes. I see no hint of retouching.

What I seem to see in that sentence is the product of the brain of a man who was an unsurpassable adept at everything that went to make up knowledge of Latin vocabulary, phraseology, usage, style, and oratorical rhetoric, who, moreover, knew the psychology of his auditors, and knew just what effects he wished to produce and just how to produce them. An orator never gets any results in a political speech by appealing to the minds (*mentes*) of his auditors; if he gets any results at all he gets them by appealing to their spirits (*animi*). All such appeals depend not on the denotation of the words used, but on their connotations and implications.

As I see it, Cicero wanted most of all to create and maintain the belief that the commonwealth had been saved. So he put that idea into an ablative absolute, as axiomatic and needing no emphasis, and he put it far along in the sentence as something to be assumed as true, not to be argued about.

Next he wanted to produce the impression that the earnest conspirators had been few and that almost all

the persons implicated in the conspiracy had been dupes of the leaders rather than spontaneously and wholeheartedly conspirators. If he had stated that as his personal opinion or merely as something to be assumed, it might not have been accepted as a fact; so he stated it as the all-but unanimous opinion of the Senate after long and careful canvassing of the facts, all of which is implied in *senatus...arbitraretur*. Then he wanted to produce the impression that any body of senators less wise than the actual Senate would have caused many more persons to be executed, more nearly ninety than nine; the action of the Senate in ordering the death of only nine was clemency not merely wise and sensible, but amazing. Then, or perhaps even before that, he wanted to produce the impression that most of the persons implicated in the conspiracy were so lukewarm toward it that they could easily be recalled to full loyalty to the existing régime. Both these impressions the entire sentence is artfully calculated to create. Lastly, and not least important, he wanted to produce the impression that the Senate had not been hasty or prejudiced in its action or in any phase of it; so here he used the word *arbitraretur*, which implies long and careful discussion and fair-minded, unhurried decision. The singulars *senatus* and *arbitraretur* here suggest unanimity on the part of the senators at the decisive vote.

I am of the opinion that, in the entire existing corpus of the world's oratory in all languages, there could not be found a sentence more perfect in its conception and more deft in its vocabulary, phraseology, rhetoric, and, most of all, in the adaptation of its implications to the effects desired and to the psychology of the auditors the orator was seeking to influence¹.

Next to Demosthenes Cicero was the greatest orator of whom we have any record, written or traditional. He was also a great Latinist, a great stylist, and by no means a despicable politician.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

EDWARD L. WHITE

¹I make only one comment. To do all this extemporaneously [see the second paragraph of Mr. White's paper] were indeed a marvel. C. K.